



## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/820,982	03/30/2001	William J. Tumulty	05793.3034	4192
22852 75	590 05/21/2004		EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER			ALIMENTI, SUSAN C	
LLP 1300 I STREET	ΓNW		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			3644	
			DATE MAILED: 05/21/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	cs			
Advisory Action	09/820,982	TUMULTY ET AL.	-//			
AUVISUIY ACIIUII	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Susan C. Alimenti	3644				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address						
THE REPLY FILED 27 April 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appearance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this application (i) a timely filed amendment whi	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	PLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adverse, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three moderned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THI te on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the I statutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection.  E FINAL REJECTION. \$  36(a) and the appropriate fee. The appropriate ex  the final Office action; or	See MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal					
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b		NOTE below.				
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below);				
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note because of the second s			ning milikuinga alban			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel NOTE:	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	ction(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	eparate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because: See		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:  Claim(s) objected to:  Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-55</u> .  Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.				
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	nt(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	o T. Gorda	~			
	SUPERVISO	RLES T. JORDAN IRY PATENT EXAMI LOGY CENTER 3601	<b>VER</b>			
S. Patent and Trademark Office		HUDE FILTER SOU	<del>,                                    </del>			

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTOL-303 (Rev. 11-03)

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The arguments presented are not deemed persuasive to overcome the rejections set forth. As discussed in the interview of 4/15/04, such arguments were not presented earlier in the prosecution and are insufficient to overcome the rejection. There is sufficient support in the patent to Ezerzer to establish that Borrodow is entitled to a date earlier than applicant's filing date, thus the reliance upon Borrodow in the rejection is proper.